Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/796,713	MIYAKE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kevin M. Bernatz	1773
All Participants: Status of Application: <u>allowed</u>		
(1) <u>Kevin M. Bernatz</u> .	(3)	
(2) Patrick Burns.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 19 September 2006	Time: <u>AM</u>	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description:	Applicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:  N/A	•	
Claims discussed: 1-3,13		
Prior art documents discussed: N/A		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE See Continuation Sheet	GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>		
•		
11. M RS		·
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Ap	plicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: the Examiner indicated that amendments to claims 1 and 13 to positively recite the subject matter of claim 3 in combination with the I110/I200 ratio limitation of claim 2 would appear to be sufficient to overcome the art of record. The Examiner indicated that applicants' specification appeared to demonstrate that unexpected results were achieved by insuring that the claimed plated layer possessed 50 - 80 weight percent Fe and a I110/I200 ratio of < 0.8. The unexpected results were the combination of both a low Hc value of 600 A/m or less (7.5 Oe or less) and a Bs of at least 2.25 T. The prior art of record was deemed to not anticipate nor render obvious the unexpected results achieved by applicants..